Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/721,414	SUGA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	J. Douglas Schultz	1635	

All Participants:

(1) *J. Douglas Schultz*.

(2) *John Lopinski*.

Status of Application: *Awaiting First Official Action on the Merits*

(3) _____.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: *12 May 2004*

Time: *10:40am*

Type of Interview:
- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No
If Yes, provide a brief description: .

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Restriction issued on October 6, 2003, Notice of non-compliance issued January 28, 2004, and applicants responses mailed November 10, 2003 and March 3, 2004.

Claims discussed:

N/A

Prior art documents discussed:

N/A

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to a restriction requirement mailed October 6, 2003, applicants amended the claims in a manner that was considered to be non-compliant because more than one sequence remained in the amended claims. A notice of non-compliance was mailed to applicants on January 28, 2004 to this effect. Applicants responded by electing Group 65. However, following a conversation with applicants' representative John Lopinski, It was agreed that both the notice of non-compliance set forth in the action mailed January 28, 2004, and applicants election of Group 65 in the response dated March 3, 2004 would be vacated, and the amended claims submitted November 10, 2003 would be examined because it is not a burden to search the two sequences submitted in said amended claims. Accordingly, the first Official action on the merits is directed to the claims submitted November 10, 2003, and is provided herewith. .